

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

WILLIAM A. HERIOT,

Petitioner(s),

VS.

WARDEN, HOCKING CORRECTIONAL
FACILITY,

Respondent(s),

[illegible]

Case Number: 1:06cv355

District Judge Susan J. Dlott

ORDER

This matter is before the Court pursuant to the Order of General Reference in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division to United States Magistrate Judge Timothy S. Black. Pursuant to such reference, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the pleadings and filed with this Court on September 13, 2007 a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 17). Subsequently, the petitioner filed objections to such Report and Recommendation (Doc. 20).

The Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered de novo all of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing, the Court does determine that such Recommendations should be adopted.

Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 1) is **DENIED** with prejudice.

A certificate of appealability will not issue with respect to Ground One of the petition because petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right based on this claim. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253 (c); Fed.R.App.P. 22(b).

A certificate of appealability will not issue with respect to Grounds Two through Six of the petition which this Court has concluded are waived and thus barred from review on procedural grounds because under the applicable two-part standard enunciated in *Slack v McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000), “jurists of reason would not find it debatable whether this Court is correct in its procedural ruling” as required under the first prong of the *Slack* standard.

The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of any Order adopting this Report and Recommendation will not be taken in “good faith” and, therefore, DENIES petitioner leave to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* upon a showing of financial necessity. *See* Fed.R.App.P. 24(a); *Kincade v. Sparkman*, 117 F.3d 949, 952 (6th Cir. 1997).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Susan J. Dlott
Susan J. Dlott
United States District Judge